



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,986	09/14/2000	Harold Rosen	pd-2000083	8909

20991 7590 11/26/2004

THE DIRECTV GROUP INC
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109
P O BOX 956
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956

EXAMINER

LY, NGHI H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2686

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/661,986

Applicant(s)

ROSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Nghi H. Ly

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2686

4. Claims 1 and 4-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perahia et al (US 6,188,896) in view of Durvasula et al (US 6,137,451).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 15, 16, 17 and 21, Perahia teaches a method of preventing interference in a communication system (see column 2, lines 58-61 and see column 4, lines 29-33) comprising, the steps of: generating a fixed reuse pattern in a service area from a high altitude communications device (see fig.6), the pattern having at least a first resource cell and a second resource cell (also see fig.6) and reshaping the antenna surface (see column 5, lines 21-25, column 8, lines 16-20 and see column 12, lines 46-48).

Perahia does not specifically disclose selectively suppressing a side lobe of a beam having a first resource by selectively reshaping the antenna surface at interference locations and maintaining a shape of the antenna in non-interference locations to form a suppressed portion and a non-suppressed portion so that the non-suppressed portion aligns with the second resource cell and a side lobe suppressed portion aligns with the first resource cell.

Durvasula teaches selectively suppressing a side lobe of a beam having a first resource (see fig.5, beam 38 and beam 42) by selectively reshaping the antenna surface at interference locations (column 2, lines 9-13, see "the reflector has been shaped specifically for coverage" and column 2, lines 13-30, see "the reflector is **reshaped** to **suppress**") and maintaining a shape of the antenna in non-interference locations to form a suppressed portion and a non-suppressed portion (the teaching of Durvasula teaches sidelobe of only one beam is suppressed, the other is not, in

Art Unit: 2686

addition, see fig.1, regions 40 and 44) so that the non-suppressed portion aligns with the second resource cell and side lobe suppressed portion aligns with the first resource cell (column 2, lines 9-13, see "the reflector has been shaped specifically for coverage" and column 2, lines 13-30, see "the reflector is reshaped to suppress". The teaching of Durvasula inherently teaches that after the reflector is reshaped, the non-suppressed portion will align with the second resource cell and side lobe suppressed portion will align with the first resource cell. In addition, see fig.1, regions 40 and 44, and beams 30 and 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Durvasula into the system of Perahia in order to reduce interference.

Regarding claims 4, 12 and 18, Perahia further teaches the first resource and the second resource comprise a frequency (see column 4, lines 43-46, "frequency reuse").

Regarding claims 5, 13 and 19, the combination of Perahia and Durvasula does not specifically disclose the first resource and the second resource comprise polarization.

~~However, polarization reuse is commonly used for resource reuse and therefore,~~
it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to design a system so the first resource and the second resource comprise polarization.

Regarding claims 6, 14 and 20, the combination of Perahia and Durvasula does not specifically disclose the first resource and the second resource comprise an

Art Unit: 2686

orthogonal code. However, orthogonal code reuse is commonly used in CDMA system for resource reuse and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to design a system so the first resource and the second resource comprise an orthogonal code.

Regarding claims 7 and 10, Parahia further teaches the high altitude communication device comprises a satellite (see fig.6).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, Parahia further teaches the high altitude communication device comprises a stratospheric platform (see fig.6, it is inherent that in the satellite-based system of Parahia include the system of stratospheric platform).

Regarding claim 22, Parahia further teaches generating the beams using an antenna on-board a high altitude communication device (see column 4, lines 29-32).

Regarding claim 23, Parahia further teaches the high altitude communication device comprises a satellite (see fig.6).

Regarding claim 24, Parahia further teaches the high altitude communication device comprises a stratospheric platform (see fig.6, it is inherent that in the satellite-based system of Parahia include the system of stratospheric platform).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (703) 605-5164.

~~The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.~~

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2686

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

11/16/04

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600